



DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL

209 E. Musser Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4201
(775) 687-4050

MEMO PERD #08/99
February 10, 1999

PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 17, 1998

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Personnel Commission was called to order by Chairman Ted Manos at 9:05 a.m., December 17, 1998, at the Reno-Sparks Convention Center, Reno. Members present: Ted Manos, Claudette Enus, James Skaggs, Victoria Riley and Teo Gamboa. Also present were: Sharon Murphy and Carol Thomas representing the Department of Personnel, and Jim Spencer representing the Attorney General's office.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to approve the agenda was seconded by Commissioner Enus and unanimously approved.

III. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the October 1 and 2, 1998, Personnel Commission meeting were approved by acclamation.

IV. REGULATION CHANGES

The Commission approved changes to the regulations by adding a definition for *pay progression date*. The revisions to the regulations were limited to changing the term *date of record* to the new term *pay progression date* and removing a reference to a form name made obsolete with implementation of the new Personnel/Payroll System. The following NAC regulations were affected: 284.132, 284.134, 284.138, 284.140, 284.182, 284.186, 284.194, 284.602.

The Commissioners unanimously approved these changes.

V. REPORT ON WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT PROCEDURE

Jim Spencer, Sr. Deputy Attorney General, gave a report on the Whistleblower complaint procedure. He explained there was a problem handling complaints because some were coming in on notes, some on letters, and others on incomplete forms. So, the Department of Personnel, with Mr. Spencer's input, changed the internal procedure for handling them. If the form is not submitted or is incomplete, the complaint is immediately returned to the complainant with instructions for correct submittal. The new procedure is working at this point. Chairman Manos thanked him for his report.

VI. OCCUPATIONAL GROUP STUDIES

A. LABORATORY SERVICES

Report on Chemist/Microbiologist Appeals

This item was reintroduced after being tabled at the October 1 and 2, 1998, Personnel Commission meeting. Chairman Manos had asked the Department of Personnel to resolve the appeals involving class specifications for the Chemist and Microbiologist series.

Chairman Manos explained it was his understanding the appeals of the chemists/microbiologists had been resolved.

Carol Thomas stated the appeals were resolved and a summary of the activity resulting in their resolution and the appellants letters withdrawing their appeals were in the report.

Chairman Manos called for a motion to approve the Laboratory Services occupational group study and the revised Chemist and Microbiologist class specifications.

Commissioner Gamboa's motion for approval was seconded by Commissioner Skaggs, and unanimously approved.

B. NURSING SERVICES

Report on Mid-Level Medical Practitioner Appeal

At the October 1 and 2, 1998, Personnel Commission meeting, the Commissioners asked the Department of Personnel to create a designation between Physician's Assistant and Advanced Nurse Practitioner including knowledge, skills and abilities and minimum qualifications. Chairman Manos asked Carol Thomas for the report.

Ms. Thomas explained the revised class specification did not address those individual practices by option but covers all the duties performed by an individual in the class who is functioning as a physician's assistant or an advanced practitioner of nursing. The language of the class specification has been approved by the Nevada Board of Medical Examiners, the Nevada Board of Nursing, the Department of Prisons and the appellant. In addition, the Department of Personnel moved the class from the Nursing sub-group to the Health Services sub-group at the appellant's request.

Chairman Manos asked for a motion to reapprove the class specification for Mid-Level Medical Practitioner, grade 39. Commissioner Skaggs' motion was seconded by Commissioner Riley, and unanimously approved.

C. PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

1. Report on Wendy Whipple's Appeal

This item was tabled at the October 1, 1998, Personnel Commission meeting. The Commission had asked the Department of Personnel to look at Ms. Whipple's position again to determine its appropriate classification. Chairman Manos asked Carol Thomas for the report.

Carol Thomas explained the appeal was resolved and Wendy Whipple had been reclassified retroactively to a Clinical Program Manager I, grade 39.

Chairman Manos stated the appeal was resolved and no motion by the Commission was required.

2. Class Specification for Psychological Developmental Counselor I & II

Carol Thomas explained this new class specification was developed as a result of an appeal by individuals in the Division of Health which was too late to be heard at the October 1, 1998, meeting. The Division of Health, the Department of Personnel and the appellants worked together to develop this new class specification.

There being no questions or discussion, Chairman Manos asked for a motion to approve the class specification for Psychological Development Counselor I and II. Commissioner Skaggs' motion was seconded by Commissioner Riley and the motion passed unanimously.

VII. CLASSIFICATION APPEAL

Thomas Lynch, Accounting Clerk III

Western Nevada Community College - Fallon

Mr. Lynch was not present. Chairman Manos asked the Department of Personnel to address the appeal.

Pat Mc Alinden, Personnel Analyst, University of Nevada, Reno, Business Center North, explained Mr. Lynch was appealing his allocation from a Management Assistant II to Accounting Clerk III. He was requesting reclassification to the Accounting Specialist series.

Ms. McAlinden explained her findings as they related to Mr. Lynch's position. In studying this position, it was determined the majority of duties were in the accounting function rather than clerical. She indicated the accounting and personnel duties performed by Mr. Lynch compared favorably to other grade 25 positions including Management Assistant II, Personnel Technician I, and Accounting Clerk III's within the University and Community College System (UCCSN) of Nevada. In order for Mr. Lynch's position to be moved to Accounting Specialist, grade 27, he would have to perform more complex accounting functions similar to other Accounting Specialists within UCCSN.

Ms. McAlinden introduced a letter from Buzz Sharmin, Dean of Off-Campus Programs, which summarized Mr. Lynch's duties. She indicated they were clearly reflective of those at the grade 25 level.

Chairman Manos referred to letters written by WNCC President, Jim Randolph, which recommended approval of this appeal and Mr. Lynch's supervisor who was also in favor of it. Both indicated his position is unique.

Ms. McAlinden clarified that Mr. Randolph endorsed the appeal but requested the Commission to further review the classification.

Chairman Manos commented that even though Mr. Lynch wasn't present, it was his understanding adequate notice of this hearing had been given.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Enus, and unanimously carried. Chairman Manos asked the Department of Personnel to notify Mr. Lynch.

VIII. DMV SERVICES TECHNICIAN/SUPERVISOR CLASSIFICATION STUDY

A. OVERVIEW

B. CLASS SPECIFICATION APPEAL

State of Nevada Employees Association

This item was moved from VIII-C on the agenda to VIII-B. The Commissioners felt the approval of the class specification was needed before hearing the appeals. Commissioner Skaggs' motion was seconded by Commissioner Riley and unanimously approved.

Chairman Manos asked for an overview of the study. Carol Thomas provided the following information:

- The study came to the Department of Personnel in January 1998, through the individual study process, which requires the incumbents to demonstrate significant change in their duties;
- There were 636 positions studied in Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety (DMV&PS) offices all over the State;
- Ten analysts conducted the study and prepared the class and series concepts;
- Significant change was found in the group as a whole including increased variety and complexity of rules and regulations affecting the positions and increased decision making. Additionally, the front-line employees have been empowered to apply more judgment and discretion in their work, they're required to attend additional training, and there has been an increased focus on problem solving and customer service.
- Of the 636 positions involved in the study, 18 went up 4 grades, 504 went up 2 grades, one went up 1 grade, 107 remained the same, and no positions were downgraded.
- The series and class concepts are clearly defined and provide a strong career path for this entire group.
- The Department of Personnel made the recommendation to move the class series to the Licensing and Regulations sub-group to recognize the emphasis on knowledge, skills, and abilities that are much more regulatory in nature than clerical in nature.

MEMO PERD #08/99

February 11, 1999

Page 6 of 25

Bruce Glover, Deputy Director, provided the DMV&PS management's view of the study. He thanked the Department of Personnel and the DMV&PS employees for their participation and hard work. Mr. Glover believes the Department of Personnel defined the current duties of the technicians very well. The study recommendations provide the technicians and the supervisors with a good career ladder within the DMV&PS that they didn't have before. It's a system where a person can grow in the department.

Mr. Glover stated the management at DMV&PS totally supported the study, even though the impact on their budget is estimated at \$2,600,000.

Commissioner Gamboa asked how the new career ladder differed from the old.

Mr. Glover explained it provides a higher entry level where employees can learn the basics and promote into different areas. A Technician IV level was added and the supervisors were upgraded to higher pay grades. They hoped the pay grades themselves would give some incentives to promote and stay with the department.

Commissioner Skaggs asked if there was a way for Technician II's to promote without having to supervise.

Carol Thomas explained the advanced journey level is the transition level. You might supervise in that level but you may also conduct the driving skills test or serve as a program expert.

Commissioner Skaggs asked for clarification between lead workers and supervisors. Carol Thomas explained the individuals in the express offices typically provide training and work direction for Technician II's or Technician III's. Full supervision includes assigning the work, reviewing the work, preparing the performance evaluation, and addressing any training or disciplinary needs.

Chairman Manos asked why oversight of the express office wasn't supervision rather than lead. Carol Thomas explained they have one person who runs the office, but the technicians are not assigned on a permanent basis. They rotate in and out of the office, and someone else actually prepares the work performance evaluations of those individuals.

Chairman Manos asked how many people worked in a typical express office. Bruce Glover replied three or four.

Chairman Manos stated it was his understanding the difference between Technician II, grade 25, and Technician III, grade 27, is differentiated between those people at the counter who are dealing face-to-face with the public and those who are behind the

MEMO PERD #08/99

February 10, 1999

Page 7 of 25

counter. He raised a question of morale regarding Technician II's who were journey level before the study.

Mr. Glover gave examples of back office functions versus the front line functions. He explained the employees at the counter are empowered within the agency to make more decisions. There are so many more aspects to consider in looking at many different statutes and regulations.

Chairman Manos indicated he had a problem with the language which defines Technician II positions as not being journey level because the positions have to fill in for the counter. Mr. Glover agreed Technician II's do fill in at the counter.

Commissioner Skaggs asked what the repetitive tasks were at the II level and how they were distinguished from the journey level.

Sandra Silva, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, referred to a list of different tasks performed by Technician II's in Title Research. Employees rotate through the tasks monthly opening mail, handling registered mail, or working on a window. In Title Production the work performance standards require employees to process 33 titles an hour.

In response to Commissioner Skaggs question regarding limited customer contact, Ms. Silva confirmed that direct person-to-person, face-to-face contact the majority of the time was one of the allocation factors.

In defining the term, journey level, Carol Thomas explained it is the level at which the majority of the positions are required to function to perform the day-to-day operations of the agency.

The Department of Personnel saw a distinction between the level at the front counters and the individuals in the back room in terms of the knowledge and skills, complexity of the job and the scope of responsibility.

Chairman Manos then clarified it was not intended in any way to downgrade the positions, but was tied to normal personnel language which defines journey level as the majority of the day-to-day positions.

Carol Thomas stated that was correct. It certainly didn't take away from the importance of the job that's being done in those back rooms or the importance of those jobs to the agency.

Ron Foster, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, pointed out 79 positions were classified at the Technician II level, and 386 positions at the Technician III level so there are chances for growth.

Chairman Manos asked Alison Reardon, State of Nevada Employees Association (SNEA), to speak to her objections to the DMV Services Technician/Supervisor class specifications.

Ms. Reardon opened with a history of this study:

- In July or August of 1997, the employees of the Reno office contacted her to find out the status of their PDQ's which had been submitted to the Department of Personnel the year before.
- The last time this series had been studied was in 1987-88.
- NPD-19's were resubmitted in January of 1998.
- The new alignment of these classifications remove supervisory duties and increase the span of supervision.
- There's an impression given in the documents that there is automatic advancement in the series and that is not the case.
- In Reno and Las Vegas, DMV offices are divided between registration and driver's license. Employees can stay in registration and never go over to driver's license and vice versa. Basically they can be stuck on one side or the other and in doing so, their career opportunities are limited.
- In 1996, the employees asked to be put into the program specialist series rather than DMV technicians. That has not been addressed by the Department of Personnel, and you will hear some appellants who believe they don't fit into these class specifications at all.
- One of the largest concerns is that the class specifications anticipate how this work will change as a result of the implementation of Genesis. Employees should be paid today for the duties they are performing today, and when Genesis comes around, the Department of Personnel should probably go back in and take a look.

Dennis Kifer of SNEA addressed the Commission about his concern with the use of the term *subjourneyman*. He believed, in this particular case, it was inappropriate terminology because:

MEMO PERD #08/99

February 10, 1999

Page 9 of 25

- It is a specialized area and it takes a lot of years to develop expertise.
- The employees are by no means subjourney in the specialized areas they work in even though it is restricted by *program area*.
- It is unfair to be suddenly differentiated from people who have knowledge of more program areas, on a general level, which ranks as higher paying over the people who have more breadth of understanding.
- They deal with difficult people too and have to make difficult decisions on the spur of the moment based on their knowledge of the program area.

Commissioner Gamboa asked what SNEA recommended.

Mr. Kifer replied he thought the terminology should be removed from the class specifications.

Carol Thomas responded the Department of Personnel didn't object to eliminating the designation of journey and advanced journey. There are other class series like that such as the Management Assistant class series.

Commissioner Enus asked if SNEA could point specifically to language in the class series that talks about what may occur in the future rather than what exists as it related to the Genesis system.

Sharon Murphy, Director, Department of Personnel, addressed the Commission stating she directed the department to incorporate what is currently known of the Genesis organization.

Ms. Murphy indicated all of the classification decisions were based solely on what these employees were doing now, not on what they would be doing in the future. As Genesis is implemented, certain positions may need adjustments. As a manager it made sense to her to be looking at both of these paths.

Commissioner Enus stated she was concerned with the opportunity to progress in the series. Does working on the driver's license side or the registration side limit a person's ability to apply for a promotional opportunity?

Mary Ellen Komac, Supervisory Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, addressed the question by directing the Commissioners to page 6 of the new class specification and the education and experience requirements. One year of experience

as a DMV Services Technician II in Nevada State service will allow employees to compete to progress to the Technician III level.

Ms. Reardon commented that when Technician II's apply for a promotional opportunity as a III and have only worked in one program area, their application is going to be scored lower than someone who was working in all programs.

Chairman Manos stated Technician II positions should be able to compete equally, and asked if any Technician II positions would work the counter and not be a specialist.

Sandra Silva, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, explained the Titling section has a window that is just for titling, and insurance verification has one window as does Special Plates. It was clarified that only Technician II's work these special windows.

Chairman Manos asked for a motion to approve the DMV class specification, removing language related to journey and advanced journey level, and moving it from the Clerical sub-group to the Licensing and Regulatory sub-group.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion was seconded by Commissioner Enus and the class specification was unanimously approved.

C. CLASSIFICATION APPEALS

TOMI CASEY, TECHNICIAN II ***Mail Room/Microfilm/Phones - Titling***

Blake Brewton represented Ms. Casey who functions as a lead person in the mail room spending the majority of her time on the phone answering registration questions and processing mail.

Chairman Manos indicated one of the basis' for Ms. Casey's appeal is that she is cross-trained and must be able to handle counterwork and, therefore, should be placed at the Technician III level.

Reta Hanks, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, further described Ms. Casey's assignments and contrasted it to positions in the Technician III class. Incumbents at this level answer more technical questions requiring a broader range of knowledge of DMV services, programs and transactions. Technician III positions also require greater problem solving and interpersonal skills in resolving conflicting documentation and controversial situations.

Ms. Hanks also indicated the positions currently allocated at the Technician II level may compete for positions in the Technician III and IV classes.

Mr. Brewton indicated Ms. Casey's appeal to the Personnel Commission requested allocation to the Program Assistant series and not the Technician series.

Ms. Hanks indicated the Department of Personnel had considered allocating some positions in the Program Assistant series. However, the Department of Personnel determined the DMV series more adequately described the work performed and the minimum requirements. The DMV Technician series requires public contact and explanation of rules and regulations rather than general clerical experience required in the Program Assistant series.

With no further questions from the Commissioners, Chairman Manos called for a motion. Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal of Tomi Casey was seconded by Commissioner Skaggs and unanimously carried.

BARBARA MEHOVES, TECHNICIAN IV
Mail Room/Microfilm/Phones - Titling

Ms. Mehoves indicated she originally appealed requesting allocation to DMV Supervisor I, but now was requesting reclassification to Program Officer II, grade 33. She provided details regarding her current duties which include supervising the activities of subordinates in the Microfilm prepping and Mail Room sections.

Ms. Hanks reiterated that the DMV series was most appropriate for all of these positions rather than the Program Officer or Program Assistant series for same reasons previously expressed.

Ms. Hanks explained that Ms. Mehoves' original NPD-19 requested reclassification to grade 29 and which the Department of Personnel recommended for her position. She then appealed requesting allocation to DMV Supervisor I, grade 31, and now is requesting reclassification as a Program Officer II, grade 33.

At Chairman Manos' request, Ms. Hanks explained that Ms. Mehoves is responsible for the work of eight employees in the Title Section. She supervises a Program Assistant I, microfilm operators, aids, and employees that answer the phone. She is requesting allocation to the level of her own supervisor, who is responsible for more than forty employees. Throughout the department, DMV Services Supervisors have direct responsibility for employees at grade level 27, 29 or higher, while Ms. Mehoves' subordinate employees range in grade from 21 to 25.

Reclassification of this position to a level equal to her supervisor would create inequities and impact four other DMV Technician IV positions who also supervise employees in this section.

Ms. Mehoves further explained that she performs the same type of duties as other supervisors because she works the counter in their absence and DMV Technician IV's come to her for answers during that time.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Manos called for a motion. Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal of Barbara Mehoves was seconded by Commissioner Enus and unanimously carried.

TITLE PRODUCTION - DAY SHIFT - 9 TECHNICIAN II'S

Ellen Barstad, Barbara Beydler, Blake Brewton, Marcia Fillmore, Mary Hill, Lisa Moya, Michelle Rasner, Daniel Smith, Dixie Stearns

Blake Brewton and Kelli Anderson of the Title Production - Day Shift represented the Technician II's who were asking for reclassification to DMV Services Technician III.

Ms. Anderson indicated Technician III positions do not require greater knowledge than back office employees, and they rely on the title area to help them answer questions.

Ms. Anderson proposed an alternative method of progression to the Technician III level.

Mr. Brewton added that because all back office Technicians are at the II level, the only way to advance is to work at the counter.

Ms. Anderson indicated employees are considered for lateral moves rather than progression to level III. Reta Hanks clarified that everyone who competes takes the same written test.

Ms. Hanks indicated these positions review documentation for accuracy and perform data entry functions to issue certificates of title, and current work performance standards require technicians to process 33 titles an hour. When documentation is incomplete or incorrect in any way, it is sent to Title Research where employees obtain missing information. Issues requiring explanations of laws, regulations and policies are referred to the supervisor, a DMV Technician IV.

Ms. Anderson disagreed and stated they could not go to their supervisor every time they have a problem but must be sufficiently capable to process the title.

Commissioner Enus remarked that in reviewing their documents, it appeared that 97% of their time was spent processing certificates of title which includes 50% reviewing legal documents, 40% processing titles, and about 7% reviewing and processing documents for accuracy.

Ms. Anderson agreed and indicated many things go into reviewing documents and ensuring they are complete and accurate.

Commissioner Enus asked if the kinds of problems encountered were generally the same over the course of a shift. Ms. Anderson replied they were.

With no further discussion, Chairman Manos called for a motion. Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal of the Technician II's in Title Production - Day Shift was seconded by Commissioner Riley, and unanimously carried.

NANCY FLORENCE, TECHNICIAN IV
Title Production - Day Shift

Velva Nichols, Technician IV, from Title Production - Night Shift, represented both she and Nancy Florence. Although they had requested a change in their classification to the Program Officer series, she would base their appeal on the original request to be classified as Supervisor I.

In explaining her duties, Ms. Nichols indicated she has full supervisory responsibility; maintains statistics; proposes budgetary items; writes procedures, policies, NRS changes and work performance standards; reviews the vehicle registration documents to determine legal compliance; provides technical expertise to customers and staff; and resolves sensitive complex issues and customer complaints and problems.

Reta Hanks replied these positions were upgraded from DMV Technician III, grade 27, to a DMV Services Technician IV, grade 29. They are now asking to be upgraded to a level above their supervisors. Their duties are similar to other positions at grade 29 which are expected to provide technical expertise to customers and staff regarding laws and regulations.

Ms. Hanks indicated reclassification of these positions to a higher level, specifically to a Supervisor I, grade 31, would create obvious inequities within that department, and it would impact the Technician IV's in insurance verification and registration renewal by mail. The Department of Personnel strongly requested these positions also remain at a grade 29.

There being no additional discussion, Chairman Manos called for a motion. Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal of Nancy Florence was seconded by Commissioner Gamboa, and unanimously carried.

Chairman Manos explained the Personnel Commission does not have the authority to set pay grades; that was done by the Legislature. He stated when the appellants provide information which clearly indicates they are asking for a pay grade in excess of their supervisor, it is difficult for the Commission to agree.

TITLE PRODUCTION - NIGHT SHIFT - 10 TECHNICIAN II'S

Kelli Anderson, Grace Flinn, Sandra Garringer, Barbara Grabski, Janice Helget, Jody Holley, Margaret McDonald-Scarborough, Robertina Pierson, Alberta Stossel, Susanne White

This group of appeals were heard in combination with the Title Production - Day Shift.

Commissioner Enus's motion to deny their appeal was seconded by Commissioner Riley, and unanimously carried.

VELVA NICHOLS - TECHNICIAN IV

Title Production - Night Shift

This appellant was heard in combination with the appeal of Nancy Florence, Technician IV, Title Production - Day Shift.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal of Velva Nichols was seconded by Commissioner Riley, and unanimously carried.

TITLE RESEARCH - 10 TECHNICIAN II'S

Marion George Allen, Christe Crook, April Deitrick, Thomas Dieneman, Linda Faisy, Sandra Osborne, Renee Phillips, Greg Ramos, Carrie Schenkhuizen, Patricia Todaro

George Allen and Patricia Todaro represented this group. Mr. Allen made the following points:

1. They felt the reclassification was based on Project Genesis' anticipated realignment of registration and driver's license and not on what their jobs are today.
2. They work independently with less supervision and make judgments.

MEMO PERD #08/99

February 10, 1999

Page 15 of 25

3. They handle an average of 32 phone calls per hour from private parties, financial institutions and car dealerships, and over the counter transactions for one thousand customers per month.
4. The Title Research section is the only one of its kind in the State. They cannot be compared to any branch or rural office.

Chairman Manos asked why they believed their positions were classified based on Project Genesis and not on what they do now. Mr. Allen replied because Personnel had indicated they do not have any face-to-face contact at the counter. Working at the counter is necessary because making judgments over the phone can be difficult.

Discussion continued on the subject of face-to-face contact, the changes Genesis will bring in the future, and Mr. Allen's opinion that the Department of Personnel hasn't classified them by what they do now.

Commissioner Enus read from the Department of Personnel's recommendation which indicated the duties and responsibilities assigned to these positions fall within the parameters of DMV Services Technician II's in rotating through specific duty assignments which include handling voice mail messages and performing counter transactions. To her, the department did acknowledge the fact there is some contact with the public.

Commissioner Gamboa asked how their jobs compared to the Technician III class concepts. Mr. Allen agreed they did not fit because they work in a single program. However, they do explain laws, regulations and policies and rotate on the counter for 30 days once every 10 months.

Ron Foster clarified they do not explain laws, regulations and policies for *all* transaction types. All transaction types means the full range of registration duties, which includes working with multiple programs and working a majority of the time at the counter.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Manos asked for a motion. Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal of the Technician II's, Title Research, was seconded by Commissioner Gamboa, and unanimously carried.

Commissioner Gamboa explained to the appellants that he thought their job duties didn't rise up to the level described in the class specifications for DMV Services Technician III, but recognized they all do a great job and have unique and specialized knowledge in a certain area.

JENNIFER BAKER - TECHNICIAN IV

Title Research

Jennifer Baker introduced herself and indicated she's been with DMV for over 18 years. She requested allocation to Supervisor I, grade 31.

She felt that comparing her position to supervisors in rural offices rather than supervisors in her own building was unfair. Ms. Baker explained that other supervisors who were classified as Technician III's (as she was before the study) were upgraded to Supervisor I, grade 31. She was only upgraded to a Technician IV.

Commissioner Riley asked if she felt the rural versus the metropolitan comparison applied to herself as well as to Ms. Nichols and Ms. Florence equally. Ms. Baker said yes; however, her section had more face-to-face contact with the public than they did.

Ron Foster explained the Department of Personnel's recommendation. Ms. Baker's NPD-19 requested upward reclassification from Driver Motor Vehicle Technician II, grade 27, to a class unspecified at grade 29. Her request was granted and now she's appealing the recommendation.

Ms. Baker interjected that she was only asking to be considered equivalent to other supervisors who were upgraded to grade 31 in Carson City.

Mr. Foster explained that granting her appeal would place her six grades higher than her subordinate Technician II's at grade 25 and would place her at the same grade level as her supervisor, grade 31. The Department of Personnel was unable to grant her request because her duties did not fit the class concepts for Supervisor I.

Commissioner Enus indicated that, consistent with the statement made earlier by Commissioner Gamboa, she thought the comparison of Ms. Baker's position appeared to firmly fit within the concepts of Technician IV.

Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal of Jennifer Baker was seconded by Commissioner Gamboa, and was unanimously denied.

DISMANTLING - TITLES

Sonya Deleon and Bryan Quell, Technician II

Ms. Deleon, representing both appellants, indicated they were appealing the allocation of their positions to DMV Services Technician II. They felt their duties were more closely described in the concept for Program Assistant III, in that the focus of a

Program Assistant III is to carry out duties which require knowledge of specialized rules, policies, processes, and purposes that are specific to a particular program.

Ms. Deleon described the nature and complexity of work, the scope of responsibility and consequence of error, level of independence, personal contacts and knowledge, skills and abilities associated with the Dismantling Section.

There were no questions, and Ron Foster provided comments on behalf of the Department of Personnel. He compared the program responsibilities assigned to the appellants to those of the Drivers' License Review, Financial Responsibility, Insurance Verification and Title Research programs.

Mr. Foster explained the dismantling program does not have the variety and complexity of duties, consequence of error or the higher skill levels required to solve problems and provide explanation of laws, regulations and policies for all types of transactions. Like other positions working in a single component of vehicle registration, the positions do not require the intensity of contact with the public demanded of Technician III's working at the registration window. The duties associated with the dismantling program are narrowly focused and are correctly recognized in the class concept for DMV Services Technician II.

Chairman Manos commented on the consequence of error relative to the Dismantling Section and further discussion followed regarding the consequence of error for the various program areas as it relates to DMV Services Technician II and III duties.

In response to a question from Chairman Manos, Mr. Foster clarified that Carson City is considered a metropolitan office rather than a rural office. Mr. Foster further explained employees in the rural offices must have knowledge of all of these programs as they issue driver's licenses and registrations, whereas the positions in the Dismantling Section are only involved with the issue of titles. In the metropolitan offices, positions in registration do everything except issue driver's licenses.

Commissioner Skaggs asked if these positions perform broad-range and multi-program transactions, or if they only have one program.

Ms. Deleon replied no one in the Carson City office does this including the registration technicians who were upgraded. She further explained she is involved with laws covering liens and frequently assists customers at the counter.

Mr. Foster replied under the DMV Services Technician II class concept, which applies to the Dismantling Section, there is limited customer contact at the counter. He indicated the Program Assistant series is a large generic class series used in agencies

which have small, unique programs. But when the program is large, like vehicle registration or workers' compensation, a more specific class series is appropriate.

Sandra Silva added these positions fit entirely within the DMV Services Technician series. Dismantling is part of titling and titling is part of registration. This series was developed for positions administering motor vehicle laws and regulations.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Enus, and carried, with Chairman Manos abstaining.

TAMMY HURST, TECHNICIAN IV
Dismantling - Titles

Ms. Hurst clarified she was requesting reclassification to Program Officer II, but would accept Program Officer I. She explained in detail the requirements of the program, including contacts with clientele, consequence of error, and the required knowledge, skills and abilities.

Ron Foster pointed out Ms. Hurst had requested upward reclassification to grade 29 on her NPD-19, which was granted. When she appealed this determination to the Director, she asked for an increase to grade 31, and today is asking for allocation to grade 33. This would place her eight grades above her subordinates and two grades above her supervisor.

Mr. Foster compared Ms. Hurst's supervisory responsibilities to those of DMV Services Supervisor II. He also provided comparisons with other Program Officers in the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety and the Attorney General's office.

Again, Mr. Foster explained the programs recognized in the Program Officer series are very small, with a small clientele, and a class would not be created for just one position. When there is a more specific class with specific knowledge, skills and abilities, it should be used.

Ms. Hurst replied her program is small and unique and doesn't involve insurance verification, vision tests, renewals by mail or license review.

Commissioner Enus asked Ms. Hurst to explain what she does in terms of training the public. Ms. Hurst explained her involvement with the general public, in person, at the counter, and also over the phone, is providing information pertinent to the Nevada Revised Statutes.

Commissioner Enus pointed out that what was being described as training is in fact interpreting regulations as a part of the whole regulatory area for the DMV series. Commissioner Enus provided additional comments regarding the responsibility the Commission had in adjudicating appeals and upholding classification principles.

Chairman Manos called for a motion. Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Enus, and carried with Commissioner Gamboa abstaining.

GERALDINE COX, SUPERVISOR I
Titling

Ms. Cox explained to the Commission she felt she was reclassified to Supervisor I because she was supervising the specialty Titling program. She went over the class concepts for DMV Services Supervisor II with the comment there are no positions functioning at that level except perhaps in the rural offices. She felt her duties are comparable to other positions allocated to DMV Services Supervisor II.

Chairman Manos asked Ms. Cox how many people she supervised and to describe their functions. Ms. Cox replied she supervises five Technician IV's assigned to the Titling Section.

Chairman Manos remarked it appears Ms. Cox' position did not meet the concept for DMV Supervisor under the old class specifications and felt the reclassification properly reallocated her position.

Reta Hanks, from the Department of Personnel, clarified that Personnel's determination regarding Ms. Cox position represents a change in title only as her grade level is being maintained. Using organizational charts, Ms. Hanks explained Ms. Cox' duties and level of responsibility and compared the position to a DMV Services Supervisor II in the Sahara office.

Commissioner Enus asked for clarification of differences between the two positions regarding program budgets or performance goals.

Ms. Hanks described the Supervisor I level as having budget input whereas Supervisor II's actually develop a budget from input at the lower levels. She also outlined the differences in the scope of program and supervisory responsibility and the development of performance goals.

Chairman Manos requested a motion. Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Riley, and unanimously carried.

INSURANCE VERIFICATION - 16 TECHNICIAN II's

Mary Alotta, Griselda Contreras-Madera, Kurt Firsted, Daniel Graham, Teri Gray, Holly Hatch, David Hoy, Eileen Joe, Linda Miller, Nicole Ponte, Kelli Quintero, Cindy Salaun, Rina Silva, John Uttinger, Teresa Van Pelt, Louis Werlinger

Kelly Quintero, representing the group, discussed in depth why the positions assigned to the Insurance Verification program belong in the Program Assistant series instead of the DMV Services Technician series. This included the duties, knowledge, skills, and abilities, personal contacts, and consequence of error associated with the program.

Chairman Manos commented on the fact that Ms. Quintero did a good job in presenting her issues.

In lieu of a presentation by the Department of Personnel, Reta Hanks answered questions from members of the Commission regarding the promotional opportunities for DMV Services Technician II's and the career ladders relative to the DMV Services and Program Assistant series.

Chairman Manos requested a motion. Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Skaggs, and unanimously carried.

SHAWN SAM, SUPERVISOR I

Insurance Verification

Shawn Sam was requesting an upgrade from DMV Services Supervisor I, grade 31, to Supervisor II, grade 33. Ms. Sam compared her position to a Program Officer position in the Drivers' License Division. In addition, she described the complexity of her duties and the scope of her program responsibilities.

In response to questions by members of the Commission, Ms. Sam clarified her request to be moved to the Program Officer series and her budget responsibilities.

Reta Hanks, Department of Personnel, described the basis for reclassification of Ms. Sam's position last year and compared the duties of her position with the class concept for DMV Services Supervisor II.

Commissioner Skaggs provided additional commentary regarding the need for career paths for non-supervisors which are parallel to those for supervisors.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal based on the class concepts already adopted was seconded by Commissioner Riley and unanimously carried.

A request was made by Alison Reardon, State of Nevada Employees Association, to change the agenda to hear the appellants from the Bureau of Enforcement rather than the Special Plates group. Chairman Manos agreed.

DARLA PERRYMAN, SUPERVISOR I
Bureau of Enforcement

Ms. Perryman explained the Bureau of Enforcement (BOE) supports occupational licensing, administrative fines, complaints, and case management programs. In her original NPD-19 she felt her position fit the Program Officer III class, grade 35. When the Department of Personnel reclassified her position to Supervisor I, grade 31, and after reading the concepts for Supervisor II, grade 33, she felt it was an alternative match. Ms. Perryman made the following points:

1. She oversees the operation and support staff of three branches; she supervises two Technician IV's who in turn supervise Technician II's.
2. The new class concept for Technician IV does not state they supervise or evaluate Technician III's.
3. There is no Supervisor II position in the Bureau of Enforcement.
4. She trains, tests, and oversees the operation of the National Crime Information Center, Nevada Criminal Justice Information System Teletype System.
5. She makes independent decisions.

In response to Chairman Manos' inquiry, Ms. Perryman explained that their Technician IV's supervise Technician III's and II's, but the class concepts say Technician IV's only supervise Technician II's. Chairman Manos requested the Department of Personnel to correct this discrepancy.

Peggy Berryman, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, explained that Ms. Perryman provides oversight of all Bureau of Enforcement licensing staff for southern Nevada, encompassing three offices. Her span of control is consistent with a counterpart position located in the Reno Bureau of Enforcement office. Similar to Ms. Perryman, the Reno DMV Services Supervisor I also provides direct supervision to a DMV Services Technician IV who in turn supervises a team of DMV Services Technician III's. Reallocation to the DMV Services Supervisor II class would result in a classification inequity. Ms. Berryman further compared the differences between Supervisor I and II.

Commissioner Enus indicated a discrepancy needed correction relative to the concepts for DMV Services Technician IV.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Manos called for a motion to revise the DMV Services Technician/Supervisor class specification, adding language that Technician IV's supervise Technician II's and III's. Commissioner Skaggs' motion to approve the change was seconded by Commissioner Enus, and unanimously approved.

Chairman Manos then called for a motion regarding Ms. Perryman's appeal. Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Gamboa, and unanimously carried.

BARBARA COVEY AND VICKI GARCIA - TECHNICIAN IV'S
Bureau of Enforcement

Jeanine Elliot-Lake, Employee Representative, State of Nevada Employees Association, introduced herself, Barbara Covey and Vicki Garcia. Both Ms. Covey and Ms. Garcia submitted their NPD-19's thinking the Program Officer II, grade 33, was more appropriate for their positions. In their appeal, they requested reallocation to Supervisor I, grade 31.

She explained the duties of these appellants do not fall within registration or driver's license, and their duties and field of expertise is specialized. She asked why their job duties aren't outlined in the class specification as they are for registration and driver's license.

Ken Goodly, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, explained the scope of responsibility for these positions was restricted to the Bureau of Enforcement functions within their respective offices. They function as first-line supervisors over lower level technicians. Comparability is found with the Reno Bureau of Enforcement office where DMV Services Technician IV's provide first-line supervision over lower level technicians and report directly to a DMV Services Supervisor I.

Chairman Manos recognized the appellants' desire to have their positions reclassified to a different area and their need for class specifications more clearly delineating their duties.

Due to time constraints, Chairman Manos closed the discussions and called for a motion. Commissioner Enus' motion to deny the appeal of Barbara Covey and Vicki Garcia was seconded by Commissioner Skaggs, and unanimously carried.

Chairman Manos asked the Commission if they felt the class specification needed to specifically address the particular duties and knowledge, skills and abilities of the Bureau of Enforcement employees. Commissioner Skaggs commented this was already covered in existing language. There were no further comments.

Commissioner Enus commented that there seemed to be a communication breakdown between the Department of Motor Vehicles and Personnel which needed to be resolved regarding the appeals already heard. Although it would not necessarily change any of their decisions, a line of communication to resolve the issues regarding upward and lateral mobility, specialty areas, and supervision would help.

RURAL OFFICES - 3 SUPERVISOR I'S

Mary Valenzuela, Dora Grund and Wendell Hammargren

Wendell (Skip) Hammargren represented the group. He indicated he and his co-workers were Supervisor II's, grade 31, before the study and now are Supervisor I's, grade 31, based on the size of their offices and the number of subordinate staff. Their knowledge, skills and abilities, scope of responsibilities, complexity of work, decision making authority, and the consequence of error were not considered. Based on a per capita, their offices process an equal number of applicants and the services performed are identical to those of Supervisor II's, grade 33.

Chairman Manos acknowledged that although they oversaw small offices, they have the same complexity of work and handle all the same functions. However, one of the criteria in distinguishing between grade levels is not only the complexity or the knowledge that is necessary, but the financial responsibility that goes along with it and the greater degree of supervision exercised.

Mr. Hammargren replied they have more responsibilities than supervisors in metropolitan offices because they are also responsible for building and grounds maintenance for their offices.

Additional discussion followed regarding the number of people each appellant supervised and the differences in pay grades between them and their subordinates.

Ron Foster explained that what distinguishes a Supervisor I in a rural office from a Supervisor II in a large metropolitan office is the level of responsibility. They both manage a DMV Services office and both must have knowledge of multiple programs. Rural supervisors have 1-6 Technicians, whereas in a metropolitan office, such as Sahara, the Supervisor II, has a staff of 83 and supervises 7 Supervisor I's directly.

MEMO PERD #08/99

February 10, 1999

Page 24 of 25

Commissioner Gamboa commented he felt the rural offices did have more responsibility because of the additional duties of building and grounds maintenance. Commissioner Skaggs commented classification should be based on size and the scope of responsibility which is a basic factor in job analysis.

Mr. Hammargren pointed out the CDL Supervisor in the Sparks office was elevated to a grade 33, but only supervises four people, and has one function, CDL. The rural offices do all of the functions including CDL.

Mr. Foster explained that of all the programs analyzed in both Registration and Driver's License, the CDL Program was the most complex. That was recognized for the position in Sparks because it has statewide responsibility for the program. Questions and discussion continued on the CDL program regarding who administered it and whether any one position had statewide responsibility.

Commissioner Enus proposed, because of the discrepancies which needed to be resolved, to table the appeals of the Rural Office Supervisor I's. Commissioner Gamboa seconded the motion to table this matter and it passed unanimously.

Chairman Manos recognized Senator Washington who asked to speak on behalf of two constituents and employees of the DMV.

Senator Washington agreed there was a communication problem between management and labor based on the job descriptions, the classifications and the information received or disseminated by the people who had complaints or wanted to be reclassified. He explained that when you have a demoralized work force, the public becomes frustrated and disheartened. He has found that when employees are not performing their duties, it is because they are unhappy, demoralized or disenfranchised, and that causes problems in our State.

Complaints are received regarding DMV probably more than others because it is the one agency where members of the general public, as a whole, have to face if they drive a vehicle or register their car. The private sector has job descriptions, classifications, titles and expectations, but even in the real world there are latitudes for flexibility. He saw no flexibility at this meeting and indicated we need to get information out correctly so people are not misled. Chairman Manos thanked Senator Washington for his comments.

VIV. UNCONTESTED CLASSIFICATION ACTION REPORT

No vote required.

X. SELECTIVE CERTIFICATION

No vote required.

XI. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

No comments.

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE SELECTION

Meeting to be in Reno with possible video conferencing to Las Vegas on Thursday, February 11, 1999.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.